

**DUANE MORRIS LLP**  
D. Stuart Bartow (CA SBN 233107)  
dsbartow@duanemorris.com  
Nicole E. Grigg (CA SBN 307733)  
negrigg@duanemorris.com  
2475 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1194  
Telephone: 650.847.4150  
Facsimile: 650.847.4151

**DUANE MORRIS LLP**  
Joseph A. Powers (PA SBN 84590)  
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*  
japowers@duanemorris.com  
Jarrad M. Gunther (PA SBN 207038)  
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*  
jmgunther@duanemorris.com  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: 215.979.1000  
Facsimile: 215.979.1020

Attorneys for Defendant  
SONICWALL INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

FINJAN, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company,

Plaintiff,

V.

SONICWALL INC., a Delaware Corporation.

Defendant.

Case No.: 5:17-cv-04467-BLF-VKD

**SONICWALL INC.'S RESPONSE TO  
FINJAN'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5 TO  
PRECLUDE EVIDENCE OF OTHER  
PENDING PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING  
FINJAN**

Date: March 18, 2021  
Time: 1:30 PM  
Courtroom: 3, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

**REDACTED**

1 **TABLE OF REFERENCED EXHIBITS<sup>1</sup>**

2 July 20, 2020 Plaintiff Finjan, Inc.'s Objections and Responses to 3 Defendant SonicWall, Inc.'s Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 11-25)	Ex. 45
---	--------

27 

---

<sup>1</sup> All exhibits are attached to the Declaration of Jarrad M. Gunther.  
28

1       The Court should deny Finjan’s attempt to present the jury with an incomplete and inaccurate  
 2 picture of its patents and licensing efforts.

3       **I.       The Court Should Exclude Mention of All (Pending And Concluded) PTO Proceedings**

4       Finjan asks the Court to “exclude[e] all mention of pending IPRs,” but does not actually  
 5 identify any pending USPTO proceedings it seeks to exclude, and SonicWall is not aware of any such  
 6 pending proceedings. As set forth in SonicWall’s co-pending Motion *in Limine* No. 5 (Dkt. 364)  
 7 (“SonicWall’s MIL No. 5”), SonicWall believes the Court should exclude *all* evidence and argument  
 8 about post-grant proceedings—both pending and completed—because they are of little (if any)  
 9 probative value and are highly prejudicial.

10      To be clear, however, if the Court allows Finjan to reference IPRs in which Finjan has been  
 11 successful (which will inevitably but improperly bolster the status of the patents in the jury’s eyes),  
 12 then the jury should also hear about all of the IPRs that Finjan has lost, to understand just how close  
 13 many of the asserted claims have already come to being invalidated.

14      **II.      Finjan’s Pending Litigations Are Relevant to Finjan’s Damages and Willfulness Claims,  
 15                   as Well as Expert Bias**

16       **A.      Finjan’s Pending Litigation Is Relevant To Witness Bias**

17      In *Finjan, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, Case No. 17-cv-0072-BLF (N.D. Ga.) (“Cisco”), the  
 18 Court held that “the experts’ potential bias is highly probative of their credibility” and permitted Cisco  
 19 the opportunity to “cross examin[e] ... Finjan’s experts on their work and associated compensation  
 20 for Finjan in other pending lawsuits.” *Id.* at Dkt. 660, at 3. Finjan has not credibly challenged the  
 21 reasonableness of this conclusion. Accordingly, the Court should allow SonicWall to make similar  
 22 challenges against Finjan’s experts, many of which are the exact same, including each of its  
 23 infringement experts, Drs. Cole, Mitzenmacher, and Medvidovic.

24       **B.      Finjan’s Pending Litigations Are Relevant to Finjan’s Damages and Willfulness  
 25                   Claims**

26      The Court should likewise deny Finjan’s request that SonicWall’s recitation of its ongoing  
 27 litigations proceedings be limited. It appears that Finjan intends to disclose to the jury each of its  
 28 licenses/settlement agreements in support of its damages claims, including its licenses with [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED],

1 [REDACTED]  
 2 [REDACTED].  
 3 SonicWall has challenged Finjan's reliance on at least the [REDACTED], Sophos, and Symantec/Blue Coat  
 4 licenses. SonicWall's Mot. in *Limine* to Exclude Dr. McDuff's Method No. 1 (Motion in *Limine* No.  
 5 2) (redacted version at Dkt. 361). If the jury learns of these completed proceedings (many of which  
 6 involved filed litigation)—and only these proceedings—it might come under the impression that  
 7 every entity that Finjan has reached out to or sued has eventually taken a license to its patents.

8 That is obviously not accurate, however. In fact, Finjan has admitted that it "has had licensing  
 9 negotiations with [REDACTED]  
 10 [REDACTED]  
 11 [REDACTED]." Ex. 45 at 9:5-8. Of these, Finjan has pending proceedings against at  
 12 least Cisco, ESET, Juniper, Palo Alto Networks, Qualys, and Rapid7, which are the subject to this  
 13 motion.

14 SonicWall should be permitted to inform the jury that, while Finjan has reached licenses and  
 15 settlements with many entities, there are many other entities that do not believe they need to take a  
 16 license and are willing to defend themselves in court to prove that point, just as SonicWall is doing  
 17 here. Without this information, the jury would be led to believe that SonicWall is essentially the lone  
 18 holdout within the industry refusing to license Finjan's patent portfolio, which would improperly  
 19 support Finjan's willfulness claim. As this Court's ruling on summary judgment confirmed with  
 20 respect to just those limited number of patents that SonicWall was able to challenge in the allotted  
 21 pages, however, SonicWall has no need to take a license to Finjan's patents.

22 The fact that many other companies continue to fight Finjan is also relevant (and responsive)  
 23 to Finjan's claim of secondary indicia of non-obviousness based on Finjan's allegation of widespread  
 24 industry recognition of the value of Finjan's patents.

25 To be sure, SonicWall will not use disparaging terms to describe Finjan, such as a patent  
 26 "troll." However, SonicWall should not be precluded from presenting the relevant facts that Finjan  
 27 often must resort to litigation to secure licenses to its patents, and even then many parties are likewise  
 28 denying that they need to take a license. Indeed, while this Court held in the 2015 *Blue Coat* case

1 that “Blue Coat shall not introduce argument or evidence on co-pending lawsuits that have not reached  
 2 a jury verdict,” it contemplated that such information could be relevant “in rebuttal to evidence  
 3 submitted by Finjan because the lawsuits may be relevant under narrow circumstances.” Order  
 4 Regarding Motions in *Limine, Finjan, Inc. v. Blue Coat Sys., LLC*, Case No. 15-cv-03295-BLF, Dkt.  
 5 404, at 5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2017). As set forth above, given that Finjan’s primary damages model  
 6 is predicated on its prior licenses (many of which were the result of litigation), SonicWall respectfully  
 7 suggests that the most appropriate manner to resolve the issue now is to deny Finjan’s motion and  
 8 address at trial any specific objections regarding the relevancy of pending lawsuits involving Finjan’s  
 9 patents.

10 Similarly, Finjan’s willfulness claim is predicated, in part, on SonicWall’s alleged knowledge  
 11 of its various patent lawsuits. SonicWall should be permitted to explain how those lawsuits do not  
 12 demonstrate any knowledge regarding SonicWall’s own alleged infringement, or otherwise show that  
 13 it would need to take a license to Finjan’s patents.

14  
 15 Dated: March 11, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

16  
 17 /s/ Nicole E. Grigg  
 18 Nicole E. Grigg (formerly Johnson)  
 19 Email: NEGriigg@duanemorris.com  
**DUANE MORRIS LLP**  
 20 2475 Hanover Street  
 21 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1194

22  
 23 Matthew C. Gaudet (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 24 Email: mcgaudet@duanemorris.com  
 25 John R. Gibson (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 26 Email: jrgibson@duanemorris.com  
 27 Robin L. McGrath (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 28 Email: rlmgrath@duanemorris.com  
 29 David C. Dotson (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 30 Email: dcslotson@duanemorris.com  
 31 Jennifer H. Forte (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 32 Email: jhforte@duanemorris.com  
 33 1075 Peachtree Street, Ste. 2000  
 34 Atlanta, GA 30309

35  
 36 Joseph A. Powers (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 37 Email: japowers@duanemorris.com  
 38 Jarrad M. Gunther (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 39 Email: jmgunther@duanemorris.com

30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

*Attorneys for Defendant  
SONICWALL INC.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of **SONICWALL INC.'S RESPONSE TO FINJAN'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5 TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE OF OTHER PENDING PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING FINJAN** was served by ECF on all counsel of record on March 11, 2021.

/s/ Nicole E. Grigg  
Nicole E. Grigg